[8th November 1935

Mr. G. R. PREMAYYA:—" Since the time of the bifurcation, may I know why no Christian has been nominated in Bobbili? "

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" We could not find a suitable candidate."

Adoption by district boards and municipalities of a cut in the salaries of elementary school teachers as per G.O. No. 749, *L. & M., dated 25th February* 1935.

* 502 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) how many district boards and municipalities have so far adopted cut in salaries of teachers in elementary schools as empowered in G.O. No. 749, L. & M., dated 25th February 1935, and what they are and what the cut introduced by each is;

(*b*) whether the reports referred to at the end of paragraph 1 of the said Government Order have been received from the district boards;

(*c*) what the district boards are which have not submitted such report and what action has been taken on them for the non-submission of the report; and

(*d*) whether a copy of the report from the Salem District Board in this behalf will be placed on the table?

A.—(*a*) G.O. No. 749, L. & M., dated the 25th February 1935, applies only to district boards: of the 17 district boards which were authorised to adopt a cut, (1) Tanjore East, (2) Malabar, (3) Vizagapatam (including Bobbili), (4) Godavari West, (5) Kanara South, (6) Ganjam and (7) Kurnool have adopted the cut as advised. Cuddapah and Kistna have enhanced the cut to As. 2, and Chittoor to 1 anna 6 pies. Trichinopoly has decided not to impose a cut.

(*b*) Yes, from all district boards.

(*c*) Does not arise.

(*d*) The report [a] from Salem is placed on the table.

Delay in the absorption of the ex-taluk board clerks of South Arcot into the service of the district board.

* 503 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. RANGASWAMI REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) the strength of the ministerial staff of the District Board, South Arcot, prior to and after the abolition of taluk boards;

(*b*) the number of taluk board clerks absorbed and unabsorbed in the district board service;

[a] Printed as Appendix III on pages 949–951 infra.

8th November 1935]

(c) in the case of those absorbed into the district board service, their service, pay drawn while in taluk board service and that now fixed by the Government together with their qualifications;

(d) when the Government issued orders selecting clerks of ex-taluk boards to district board service;

(e) when appointments of such selected clerks were made by the President of South Arcot District Board; and

(f) whether any complaints have been received by the Government from any of the ex-taluk board employees in South Arcot district regarding their grievances for delay in appointing them?

A.—(a) The ministerial staff of the South Arcot District Board before the abolition of taluk boards was 55 excluding one manager of the District Board Office, another of the District Board Engineer's Office and an accountant. The strength of the staff after the abolition of taluk boards is sixty-nine which excludes one Secretary, two Superintendents, one Manager of the District Board Engineer's Office and one Accountant.

(b) The additional posts of clerks (14) sanctioned to the district board consequent upon the abolition of taluk boards were filled by the appointment of ex-taluk board clerks. Government have no information in regard to the number of ex-taluk board clerks still left unabsorbed.

(c) Government do not consider that any useful purpose will be served by furnishing a statement of these particulars.

(d) The orders of Government are dated the 28th May 1934 and 28th August 1934.

(e) Government have no information.

(f) No.

Irrigation

Disposal of the buildings at Mettur.

* 504 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) what the Government have done with their buildings at Mettur;

(b) how many have been sold in auction, what the amount fetched by them is and what the original cost of constructing them was;

(c) whether it is a fact that the buildings constructed for the occupation of upper and lower division clerks cannot endure to stand long since they are not of strong structure;

(d) if so, what the Government propose to do with them; and